



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,550	12/11/2003	Oded Grinberg	017900-004110US	2429

59734 7590 04/10/2006

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER

PATEL, DHAIRYA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/734,550	GRINBERG, ODED
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dhairya A. Patel	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication filed on 1/13/2006. Claims 1-24 were originally presented. Claims 25-28 are newly added claims.
2. This amendment has been fully considered and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7,10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basin et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2002/0120639 (hereinafter Basin) in view of Krause et al. U.S. Patent # 6,160,554 (hereinafter Krause) further in view of Laverty et al. U.S. Patent # 6,771,384 (hereinafter Laverty).

As per claim 1, Basin teaches a method for generating a preview of a content package file, the method comprising:

-retrieving first level content files referred to in the content package file (Paragraph 37);

The reference teaches retrieving from the zip file (content package file) number of files (first level content files)(Fig. 4)(Fig. 9). In figure 9 it teaches extracted files for example "pkzip25.exe" (first level content file)

-extracting content from the first level content files and replacing references to the first level content files in the content package file with the content extracted from the first level content files to create a combined file. (Fig. 9)(Paragraph 39)(Paragraph 37 lines 4-16)

The reference teaches creating a zip file (combined file) with the content from the first level content files, which are extracted when the user selects PKZIP\extract here (content extracted from first level content files)(Paragraph 37 lines 4-16).

-creating a preview of a least a portion of the content package file based on the content in the combined file. (Paragraph 35)(Fig. 9)(Paragraph 36)

The reference teaches displaying (previewing) the contents of the file in the zip file (combined file)

Basin fails to teach wherein information rendered by the preview displays at least some of the content extracted from the first level content files and content from the second package file wherein the preview displays a simulated version of the content package modified with the content from the combined file, wherein the preview occurs prior to generating a modified content package file from the combined file. Krause teaches creating a preview of a least a portion of the content package file based on the content in the combined file (column 3 lines 35-41) wherein information rendered by the preview displays at least some of the content extracted from the first level content files (column 3 lines 7-15) and content from the second package file (column 3 lines 22-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Krause's invention in Basin's invention to come up

with previewing the some of the content of the first level content files and content from the second package file. The motivation for doing so would have been to offer automatic and almost instantaneous method for previewing the contents of a file without having to a launch an application (column 4 lines 25-29).

Basin and Krause both fails to teach the displays a simulated version of the content package modified with the content from the combined file, wherein the preview occurs prior to generating a modified content package file from the combined file. Laverty teaches the displays a simulated version of the content package modified with the content from the combined file (Fig. 7)(column 12 lines 42-51)(column 22 lines 15-32), wherein the preview occurs prior to generating a modified content package file from the combined file (Fig. 7)(Fig. 16)(column 12 lines 42-51)(column 14 lines 25-28)(column 22 lines 15-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Laverty's teaching in Basin and Krause's teaching to come up with previewing a simulated version of the content package prior to generating a modified content package file. The motivation for doing so would been so check whether if there are any errors or the preview looks like the way the user desired therefore any changes can be made before merging the files.

As per claim 2, Basin, Krause and Laverty teaches the method according to claim 1 but Basin further teaches, wherein the preview of the content package file includes meta-data about the first level content files. (Figure 9)

The reference teaches which first level content files extracted/tested (meta-data) in the content package file.

As per claim 3, Basin, Krause and Laverty teaches the method according to claim 1 but Basin further teaches further comprising:

-determining whether the first level content files contain references to second level content files (Fig. 9). The figure teaches first level content files with the "+" signs and underneath it a second level content file.

As per claim 4, Basin, Krause and Laverty teaches the method according to claim 1 but Basin further teaches further comprising:

-if the first level content files contain reference to second level content files, retrieving the second level content files; (Fig. 9)(Fig. 4). The figure teaches second level files extracted (retrieved) with the first level content files. The second level files are listed under the first level files:

-extracting content from the second level content files and replacing the reference with content from the second level content files (Fig. 9)(Fig. 4) (Paragraph 39)

As per claim 5, Basin teaches the method according to claim 4 wherein the preview of the content package file contains information about the first level and the second level content files in a hierarchical format. (Fig. 9) (Paragraph 35)(Paragraph 36)

The reference teaches the display content of the files and according to figure 9 it is in hierarchical format.

As per claim 6, Basin teaches the method according to claim 5 wherein the hierarchical format of the preview is expandable to view the information about the first level and the second level content files. (Fig. 9) (Paragraph 35)(Paragraph 36)

The reference teaches first level and the second level files in hierarchical format and to preview is expandable which is done with the first level file having the "+" and the second level file underneath it.

As per claim 10, Basin, Krause and Laverty teaches the method according to claim 1 but Basin further teaches further comprising:

-displaying a notification if any of the references to any content files contain errors(Paragraph 37)

The reference teaches showing the error to files in the dialogue box (displaying notification).

As per claim 11, Basin teaches a computer program product for previewing a content package file comprising code stored on a computer readable medium, the code comprising:

-code for fetching first level content files referred to in the content package file (Paragraph 37);

The reference teaches retrieving from the zip file (content package file) number of files (first level content files)(Fig. 4)(Fig. 9). In figure 9 it teaches extracted files for example "pkzip25.exe" (first level content file)

-code for obtaining content from the first level content files and replacing references to the first level content files in the content package file with the content extracted from the first level content files to create a combined file (Fig. 9)(Paragraph 39) (Paragraph 37 lines 4-16).

The reference teaches creating a zip file (combined file) with the content from the first level content files, which are extracted when the user selects PKZIP\extract here (content extracted from first level content files)(Paragraph 37 lines 4-16).

-code for generating a preview of the content package file based on the content in the combined file (Paragraph 35)(Fig. 9)(Paragraph 36)

The reference teaches displaying (previewing) the contents of the file in the zip file (combined file)

Basin fails to teach wherein information rendered by the preview displays at least some of the content extracted from the first level content files and content from the second package file. Krause teaches code for generating a preview of the content package file based on the content in the combined file (column 3 lines 35-41) wherein information rendered by the preview displays at least some of the content extracted from the first level content files (column 3 lines 7-15) and content from the second package file (column 3 lines 22-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Krause's invention in Basin's invention to come up with previewing the some of the content of the first level content files and content from the second package file. The motivation for doing so would have been to offer automatic and almost instantaneous method for previewing the contents of a file without having to a launch an application (column 4 lines 25-29).

Basin and Krause both fails to teach the displays a simulated version of the content package modified with the content from the combined file, wherein the preview occurs prior to generating a modified content package file from the combined file.

Laverty teaches the displays a simulated version of the content package modified with the content from the combined file (Fig. 7)(column 12 lines 42-51)(column 22 lines 15-32), wherein the preview occurs prior to generating a modified content package file from the combined file (Fig. 7)(Fig. 16)(column 12 lines 42-51)(column 14 lines 25-28)(column 22 lines 15-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Laverty's teaching in Basin and Krause's teaching to come up with previewing a simulated version of the content package prior to generating a modified content package file. The motivation for doing so would have been to check whether if there are any errors or the preview looks like the way the user desired therefore any changes can be made before merging the files.

As per claim 12, Basin, Krause and Laverty teaches a computer program product of claim 11 but Basin further teaches further comprising:

-code for displaying a notification if any of the references to the first level content files contain errors (Paragraph 37).

The reference teaches showing the error to files in the dialogue box (displaying notification).

As per claim 13, Basin, Krause and Laverty teaches a computer program product of claim 11 but Basin further teaches further comprising:

-code for determining whether any of the first level content files contain references to second level content files (Fig. 9). The figure teaches first level content files with the "+" signs and underneath it a second level content file.

As per claim 14, Basin teaches the computer program product of claim 13 further comprising:

-code for fetching the second level content files referred to in the first level content files (Fig. 9)(Fig. 4). The figure teaches second level files extracted (fetching) with the first level content files. The second level files are listed under the first level files.

-code for obtaining content from the second level content files (Fig. 9)(Fig. 4) (Paragraph 39).

-code for replacing the references to the second level content files with the content from the second level content files to create the combined file (Fig. 9)(Fig. 4) (Paragraph 39).

As per claim 15, Basin teaches the computer program product of claim 14 wherein the code for previewing the content package file displays the content from the first level and the second level content files in a hierarchical format. (Fig. 9) (Paragraph 35)(Paragraph 36)

The reference teaches the display content of the files and according to figure 9 it is in hierarchical format.

As per claim 16, Basin teaches the computer program product of claim 15 wherein the hierarchical format is expandable to view the content from the first level and the second level content files. (Fig. 9) (Paragraph 35)(Paragraph 36)

The reference teaches first level and the second level files in hierarchical format and to preview is expandable which is done w/ the first level file having the "+" and the second level file underneath it.

4. Claims 7,17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basin et al. U.S Patent Publication # 2002/0120639 (hereinafter Basin) in view of Krause et al. U.S. Patent # 6,160,554 (hereinafter Krause) further in view of Laverty et al. U.S. Patent # 6,771,384 (hereinafter Laverty) as applied to claim 1, above, in further view of Lovvik et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2003/0140065 (hereinafter Lovvik)

As per claim 7, Basin, Krause and Laverty teaches the method according to claim 1 but both fails to teach importing content package file to the portal server computer. Lovvik teaches importing content package file to the server computer (Paragraph 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Lovvik's invention in Basin and Krause and Laverty's invention to come up with importing content package file to the server computer. The motivation for doing so would have been to use the imported content package file in a software development environment.

As per claim 17, Basin, Krause and Laverty teaches the computer program product of claim 11 but fails to teach a code for importing content package file to the portal server computer. Lovvik teaches code for importing content package file to the server computer. (Paragraph 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Lovvik's invention in Basin and Krause's invention to come up with importing content package file to the server computer. The motivation for doing so would have been to use the imported content package file in a software development environment.

5. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Basin et al. in view of Krause et al. in view of Laverty in view of Lovvik et al. as applied to claim 7, above, and further in view of Hull et al. U.S. Patent # 6,772,338 (hereinafter Hull).

As per claim 8, Basin, Krause, Laverty and Lovvik teaches the method according to claim 7 teach storing content package file and the first level content files on the portal server computer, but fails to teach the first level content files overwrite duplicative files that are stored on the portal server computer. Hull teaches the first level content files overwrite duplicative files that are stored on the computer. (column 7 lines 32-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Hull's invention into Basin's, Krause's, Laverty's and Lovvik's inventions to come up with overwriting duplicative files. The motivation for doing so would have been to save disk space or to avoid confusing with multiple duplicative files.

As per claim 9, Basin, Krause, Laverty and Lovvik teaches the method according to claim 7 teach storing content package file and the first level content files on the portal server computer, but fails to teach the first level content files do not overwrite duplicative files that are stored on the portal server computer. Hull teaches the first level content files not to overwrite duplicative files that are stored on the computer. (column 7 lines 32-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Hull's invention into Basin's, Krause's, Laverty's and Lovvik's inventions to come up with not overwriting duplicative files. The motivation for doing so would have been to multiple copies of the files in case the original file goes corrupt or missing.

6. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basin et al. in view of Krause et al. and as applied claim 11, above, further in view of Hull et al. U.S. Patent # 6,772,338 (hereinafter Hull).

As per claim 18, Basin, Krause and Laverty teaches the computer program product of claim 11 further comprising a code for storing content package file and the first level content files on the portal server computer (Paragraph 5), but fails to teach the first level content files do not overwrite duplicative files that are stored on the portal server computer. Hull teaches the first level content files not to overwrite duplicative files that are stored on the computer. (Column 7 lines 32-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Hull's invention into Basin's, Krause's inventions to come up with not overwriting duplicative files. The motivation for doing so would have been to multiple copies of the files in case the original file goes corrupt or missing.

7. Claims 19-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basin et al. U.S Patent Publication # 2002/0120639 (hereinafter Basin) in view of Lovvik et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2003/0140065 (hereinafter Lovvik) further in view of Krause et al. U.S. Patent # 6,160,554 (hereinafter Krause) further in view of Laverty et al. U.S. Patent # 6,771,384 (hereinafter Laverty).

As per claim 19, Basin teaches a computer system that previews a content package file containing reference to content files, the computer system comprising:
-fetching content files referenced within the content package file (Paragraph

37); The reference teaches retrieving from the zip file (content package file) number of files (first level content files)(Fig. 4)(Fig. 9). In figure 9 it teaches extracted files for example "pkzip25.exe" (first level content file),

-replaces references to the content files with content extracted from the content files to create a combined file (Fig. 9)(Paragraph 39)

The reference teaches creating a zip file (combined file) with the content from the first level content files

-creates a preview screen of the content package file and the content files using combined file (Paragraph 35)(Fig. 9)(Paragraph 36)

The reference teaches displaying (previewing) the contents of the file in the zip file (combined file)

-a client that displays the preview screen (Fig. 9)(Fig. 4)

The references the preview screen on the client display.

Basin fails to teach a portal server. Lovvik teaches a portal server to fetch content files (Paragraph 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Basin's invention in Lovvik's invention to come up with a portal server to fetch the content files. The motivation for doing so would have been to fetch the content files and store it on the portal server.

Basin and Lovvik both fails to teach wherein information rendered by the preview screen displays at least some of the content extracted from the first level content files and content from the second package file. Krause teaches a client that displays the preview screen (Fig. 1 element 140) wherein information rendered by the preview

screen (Fig. 1 element 140) (column 3 lines 35-41) displays at least some of the content extracted from the first level content files (column 3 lines 7-15) and content from the second package file (column 3 lines 22-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Krause's invention in Basin and Lovvik's invention to come up with previewing the some of the content of the first level content files and content from the second package file. The motivation for doing so would have been to offer automatic and almost instantaneous method for previewing the contents of a file without having to a launch an application (column 4 lines 25-29).

Basin, Lovvik and Krause fails to teach the displays a simulated version of the content package modified with the content from the combined file, wherein the preview occurs prior to generating a modified content package file from the combined file. Laverty teaches the displays a simulated version of the content package modified with the content from the combined file (Fig. 7)(column 12 lines 42-51)(column 22 lines 15-32), wherein the preview occurs prior to generating a modified content package file from the combined file (Fig. 7)(Fig. 16)(column 12 lines 42-51)(column 14 lines 25-28)(column 22 lines 15-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Laverty's teaching in Basin, Lovvik and Krause's teaching to come up with previewing a simulated version of the content package prior to generating a modified content package file. The motivation for doing so would been so check whether if there are any errors or the preview looks

like the way the user desired therefore any changes can be made before merging the files.

As per claim 20, Basin, Lovvik, Krause and Laverty teaches the computer system according to claim 19 but Basin further teaches wherein the preview screen displays a notification if any of the references contain error (Paragraph 37).

The reference teaches showing the error to files in the dialogue box (displaying notification).

As per claim 21, Basin, Lovvik, Krause and Laverty teaches the computer system according to claim 19, but Basin further teaches wherein the preview screen displays the content from the content files in an hierarchical format. (Fig. 9) (Paragraph 35)(Paragraph 36)

The reference teaches the display content of the files and according to figure 9 it is in hierarchical format.

As per claim 22, Basin, Lovvik, Krause and Laverty teaches the computer system according to claim 19 but Basin and Krause fails to teach the portal server imports the content package file and the content files from the client if a user selects an import option after viewing the preview screen. Lovvik teaches the portal server imports the content package file if the user selects import option (Paragraph 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement's Basin's invention in Lovvik's invention to come up with the portal server importing the content package files if the user selects the import option. The motivation

for doing so would have been to use the imported content package file in a software development environment.

As per claim 23, Basin, Lovvik, Krause and Laverty teach the computer system according to claim 19 but Basin further teaches wherein the content files include first level content files and second level content files. (Fig. 9) The figure teaches first level content files with the "+" signs and underneath it a second level content file.

As per claim 24, Basin, Lovvik and Krause teaches the computer system according to claim 19 but Basin further teaches wherein the preview screen displays meta-data about the content files (Figure 9).

The reference teaches which first level content files extracted/tested (meta-data) in the content package file.

8. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basin et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2002/0120639 (hereinafter Basin) in view of Laverty et al. U.S. Patent # 6,771,384 (hereinafter Laverty).

As per claim 25, Basin teaches a method of previewing the generation of a content package file, the method comprising:

-extracting content from first level content files referred to in a content package file Paragraph 37);

The reference teaches retrieving from the zip file (content package file) number of files (first level content files)(Fig. 4)(Fig. 9). In figure 9 it teaches extracted files for example "pkzip25.exe" (first level content file)

-extracting content from one or more lower level content files referenced to the first level content files and replacing references to the first level content files and the one or more lower level content files with at least some of the extracted content to generate a combined content file representing a modified version of the content package file; and (Fig. 9)(Paragraph 39)(Paragraph 37 lines 4-16)

The reference teaches creating a zip file (combined file) with the content from the first level content files, which are extracted when the user selects PKZIP|extract here (content extracted from first level content files)(Paragraph 37 lines 4-16).

-previewing the modified version of the content package file to determine if there are issues associated with generating a modified content package file using the combined file content.

Basin fails to teach previewing the modified version of the content package file to determine if there are issues associated with generating a modified content package file using the combined file content. Laverty teaches previewing the modified version of the content package file to determine if there are issues associated with generating a modified content package file using the combined file content (Fig. 7)(Fig. 16)(column 12 lines 42-51)(column 14 lines 25-28)(column 22 lines 15-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Laverty's teaching in Basin's teaching to come up with previewing a modified version of the content package to determine issues associated with generating a modified content package file. The motivation for doing so would have been to check

whether if there are any errors or the preview looks like the way the user desired therefore any changes can be made before merging the files.

As per claim 26, Basin and Laverty teaches the method of claim 25, but Laverty further teaches wherein the issues comprise errors associated with file location or file name (column 23 lines 56-60).

9. Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basin et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2002/0120639 (hereinafter Basin) in view of Laverty et al. U.S. Patent # 6,771,384 (hereinafter Laverty) further in view of Hull et al. U.S. Patent # 6,772,338 (hereinafter Hull).

As per claim 27, Basin and Laverty teaches the method of claim 25, wherein previewing the combined content file comprises identifying any of the first level content files or any of the one or more lower level content files but fails to teach the first level content files overwrite existing files to generate the modified content package file. Hull teaches the first level content files or any of the one or more lower level content files that overwrite existing files to generate the modified content package file (column 7 lines 32-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Hull's invention into Basin's and Laverty's inventions to come up with overwriting duplicative files. The motivation for doing so would have been to save disk space or to avoid confusing with multiple duplicative files.

As per claim 28, Basin, Laverty and Hull teaches the method of claim 27, but Hull further wherein identifying comprises providing an option for allowing or disallowing

overwriting existing files with the first level content files or any of the one or more lower level content files. (column 7, lines 32-53).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 1/26/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per remarks, Applicant stated the following:

A). As per claim 1, applicant stated Basin and Krause alone or in combination does not teach "replacement of reference with content or the creation of preview simulating the result of the processing the content package file before it is processed into a modified content package file.

As per remark A, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in (Paragraph 35)(Fig. 9)(Paragraph 36) Basin teaches displaying (previewing) the contents of the file in the zip file (combined file) and it lets the users view the content of the package which same as previewing. For example when one is previewing an item they are just viewing that item UNLESS, there is any action associated with the item after the viewing is done. In case of the claim language, Basin teaches previewing the portion of the content package file which is viewing the contents of the file in the zip file because there is no action taking place as in what is done with the content package file afterwards. Although the amended claim 1 teaches the limitations which states the action which is done after previewing, that limitation has been taught by the Laverty as stated above in the office action.

B). As per claim 1, applicant also stated that Basin does not teach any uses of content.

As per remark B, Examiner would like to point out that Fig. 9 shows the extracted file and also seeing the content of the file because in Fig. 9, examiner would like to point out that files listed "pkzip25.exe" are content of the pkzip25.exe package/file. Therefore that is content of the file.

As per arguments for claim 11 and 19, please refer to remarks for claim 1, since claim 11 and 19 teaches same limitation/arguments.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A). "System and method for manipulating and managing computer archive files" by Basin et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2002/0120639

B). "Method and apparatus for processing a streamed zip file" by Lovvik et al. U.S. Patent Publication # 2003/0140065

C). "Device for transferring data between an unconscious capture device and another device" by Hull et al. U.S. Patent # 6,772,338.

D). "Computer file content preview window" by Krause et al. U.S. Patent # 6,160,554.

12. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three)

Months and 0 (zero) days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the applicant (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

13.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dhairy A. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5809. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAP

Khanh Dinh
Primary Examiner